

6 March 1957

Geographic Research Area Comments on Fitness Report Weaknesses

1. In general, the form appears more suitable for DD/P than DD/I or DD/S.

2. The appraisal system does not yet provide sufficient safeguards against non-uniform performance by the raters. Consistency is lacking as between raters, and can be lacking as between times of rating by the same rater. In addition, ratings of professional personnel seem to differ from those of clericals. Stronger guidelines on performance standards and on rating procedures are needed if ratings are to be both honest and fair.

3. More emphasis needs to be given to the notation of employee weaknesses; raters slur over this, despite the fact that the form is intended to serve as a tool of personnel guidance as well as performance appraisal.

4. There appears to be too big a gap between the following appraisal choices:

Section C.1. -- choices 3 and 4

Section D -- choices 2 and 3, 3 and 4, 4 and 5

5. A long, hard look should be directed at Section G.1., choices 5, 6, and 7.

6. More guidance is needed on Section G.2. with respect to the use of zeros. "Not frequent" seems appropriate to DD/P, but not to the rest of the Agency.

7. Improvement can still be made in Section I. Items 23 and 26 should be deleted. Items 4 and 19, 10 and 24, 16 and 30 are too similar or else easily mis-interpreted. The intent of Item 10 is unclear.

Distribution:

O&I - Chief, St/A

2 - Ch/G

25X1A9a ORR/Ch/G: [REDACTED]:jmc/2800(6 March 1957)